BOSTON UNIVERSITY Bosto	n University Questrom School of Business	
Are Platfori Marshall Van Alstyne Boston University mva@bu.edu InfoEcon@twitter.com	m Firms Different? Geoffrey Parker Dartmouth & MIT Geoffrey.g.parker@ dartmouth.edu g2parker@twitter.com	
Twitter: @InfoEcon :: mva@bu.edu :: Platform	Economics.com © 2019 Van Alstyne & Parker	





Firm	Start year	Employees	Mkt Cap (\$B)	
вмw	1916	131,000	40	
Uber	2009	16,000	54	
Marriott	1927	177,000	39	
Airbnb	2008	10,000	38	
Walt Disney	1923	199,000	236	
Facebook	2004	30,000	514	
IBM	1911	350,000	127	
Salesforce	1999	35,000	133	
New York Times	1851	3,700	5	
Twitter	2006	3,300	33	

Variable	Forbes Global 2000	Industry Control Sample (minus the 43 platforms)	All Digital Platforms	Innovation Platforms	Transaction Platforms
Number of Firms	1,939	100	43	18	25
Sales (Million\$)	\$5,586	\$4,845	\$ 4,335	\$10,118	\$ 2,119
Employees	18,900	19,000	9,872***	26,600	6,349
Operating Profit %	13%	12%	21%***	21%	21%
Market Value (Million\$)	\$6,876	\$8,243	\$21,726***	\$37,901	\$13,277
Mkt Value-Sales Multiple	1.39 🔽	1.94	5.35***	4.19	7.07
R&D/Sales	4%	9%	13%***	13%	11%
S&M + G&A/Sales	16%	17%	24%***	22%	33%
Growth Sales	8%	9%	18%***	13%	29%
Growth Market Value	10%	8%	14%***	12%	21%
Observations	5,121	1,018	374	239	135
Notes: *** = p < 0.001 for Industry Sample vs. All Digital Platforms comparison using two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test Mkt Value-Sales Multiple = ratio of market value compared to prior year sales S&M + G&A/Sales = Sales and Marketing Expenses + General and Administrative Expenses divided by Sales Growth numbers refer to prior year data Observations refer to number of years of data for each firm.					















How should we organize production: Markets, Hierarchies or Platforms?					
Platform	Open Innovation : The platform orchestrates. It chooses <i>openness</i> (i.e. how much σ to give away) and <i>competition policy</i> (i.e. <i>t</i> how long developers can earn π_d before their code goes to other developers). Developers own production.				
Hierarchy	 Vertical Integration: Platform makes all decisions and owns all production. This implies: 1. No subsidy cost σ reduction in profit 2. Ability to build on all V not just (1-σ)V and no expiration of property rights 3. Royalties φ are 100% 4 but no spillover 				
Market	 Decentralized Market: <i>N</i> developers decide independently. Each owns individual production: 1. Can publish code for <i>N</i>-1 others to use at cost δv representing loss in pricing power 2. Can build on any published code from <i>N</i>-1 other developers 3. Get spillover benefits in period 2 of (<i>N</i>-1)^α when others publish 4 but individual profits higher when individual developers don't publish 				
Twitter:	@InfoEcon :: mva@bu.edu :: PlatformEconomics.com © 2018 Parker, Van Alstyne 13				

The Inverted Firm Hypothesis

Proposition 1: Vertical Integration dominates Open Innovation for most parameter values. However, there is a unique network effect $N_d > N_d$ such that for all values greater than the threshold, Open Innovation dominates Vertical Innovation.

Proposition 2: If a finite proprietary period t < ∞ maximizes profits, then *N* developers will prefer a contract that forces cooperation when the number of developers exceeds a threshold bounded by $N_d > 2^{1/\alpha}$. Then *Open Innovation* dominates *Decentralized Markets*

Externalities imply that platforms dominate both markets and hierarchies. *The firm "inverts:" production moves from inside to outside.*

© 2018 Parker, Van Alstyne 14

Twitter: @InfoEcon :: mva@bu.edu :: PlatformEconomics.com

























© 2019 Van Alstyne & Parker

Tom Goodwin, Sr. VP of Strategy Havas Media

Twitter: @InfoEcon :: mva@bu.edu :: PlatformEcon



























A platform is a system that can be... adapted to countless needs and niches that the platform's original developers could not possibly have contemplated..."

Twitter: @InfoEcon :: mva@bu.edu :: PlatformEconomics.co



 Mark Andreessen: Venture Capitalist, Netscape
 Second HP, eBay

 © 2019 Van Alstyne & Parker
 Founder, Board HP, eBay





















Platform Strategy Differs					
Product		Platform			
Distinct: Buyers, Suppliers, Substitutes, Entrants, Rivals	– Market	Forces –	Overlap: Consumers ~ producers, competitors ~ complementors		
Core Competencies	– Fo	cus –	Core Interactions		
Supply Side	– Scale Ec	onomies -	- Demand Side		
Own Inimitable Resources	– Ass	ets –	Community as Asset		
Cost Leadership / Product Differentiation	– Goal /	Metric –	Engagement, Positive Spillovers, Just Governance		
Barriers to Entry, Boulevards for Exit	– Acc	ess –	Permissionless Entry, Open Around Key Control Points		
By Firm	– Innov	ration –	By Firm and Ecosystem		
			@InfoEcon		
Twitter: @InfoEcon :: mva@bu.edu :: PlatformEconomics.com © 2019 Van Alstyne & Parker					









<section-header><text><text><text><text><text>







1. Why do platform firms have high market capitalization but so few employees? Inverted firms harness users as producers, representing an external labor force, not counted among the traditional workforce. 2. How do platform firms scale so fast? Shifting production outside, they can have zero marginal costs. Uber does not own its cars. Airbnb does not own its rooms. Facebook does not produce its own content. Not incurring the costs of production, they can scale as fast as they can add partners. 3. How do platform firms constantly beat product firms? Platform value appreciates through use whereas product value depreciates through use. Platforms harness resources they do not own. Innovation happens at a faster pace. 4. Why is the shift in executive mindset so hard? Executives familiar with managing proprietary control must transition to managing open orchestration, from resources they control to resources unknown partners must volunteer. 5. What is the right regulation? Will interventions such as break up (antitrust), GDPR (privacy), or PSD2 (open banking) increase welfare? Breakup would increase competition but decrease network effects and reduce value. GDPR restores privacy but creates islands of negotiation and hidden information, reducing value. By contrast, PSD2 acts like "essential facilities" doctrine and enables competition on network resources, creating value.





















